



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/766,911

01/30/2004

Frederic Sgier

09955.0025-00000

4613

22852

7590

09/22/2009

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

WAGGLE, JR, LARRY E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3775

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/22/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/766,911	Applicant(s) SGIER ET AL.	
	Examiner Larry E. Waggle, Jr	Art Unit 3775	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Larry E. Waggle, Jr. (3) Arpita Bhattacharyya.

(2) James Swiger. (4) Elizabeth Burke.

Date of Interview: 15 September 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Martin et al. (US Patent 5368594), Vignaud et al. (US Patent 5176680) and Schlapfer et al. (US Patent 5501684).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant's arguments with respect to the combination of Martin et al. and Vignaud et al. are persuasive as to the exact reasoning for the combination. It was discussed that the applicants consider adding more detail to the structure of the cap with respect to the allowance of angular adjustment given the discloses degrees of freedom to overcome the rejection of record. Any amendments would require further search and consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Larry E Waggle, Jr/ Examiner, Art Unit 3775	/Thomas C. Barrett/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3775
---	---